	3.	On or about August 24, 2012, Respondent was served by Certified and First Class
Mail	copies	of the Accusation No. 2013-143, Statement to Respondent, Notice of Defense,
Requ	est for	Discovery, and Discovery Statutes (Government Code sections 11507.5, 11507.6,
and 1	1507.7	7) at Respondent's address of record which, pursuant to California Code of
Regu	lations	s, title 16, section 1409.1, is required to be reported and maintained with the Board
Respo	ondent	's address of record was and is:

217 W. 66th Street Los Angeles, CA 90003.

4. On or about August 24, 2012, Respondent was served by Certified and First Class Mail copies of the Accusation No. 2013-143, Statement to Respondent, Notice of Defense, Request for Discovery, and Discovery Statutes (Government Code sections 11507.5, 11507.6, and 11507.7) at:

1106 West Bell Rd., Apt. 2160 Phoenix, AZ 85028.

- 5. Service of the Accusation was effective as a matter of law under the provisions of Government Code section 11505, subdivision (c) and/or Business & Professions Code section 124.
- 6. On or about September 10, 2012, the first class mailings described in paragraphs 3 and 4 were returned to the Board marked "Attempted Not Known." As of October 1, 2012, neither of the Certified Mailings described in paragraphs 3 and 4 were returned.
 - 7. Government Code section 11506 states, in pertinent part:
 - (c) The respondent shall be entitled to a hearing on the merits if the respondent files a notice of defense, and the notice shall be deemed a specific denial of all parts of the accusation not expressly admitted. Failure to file a notice of defense shall constitute a waiver of respondent's right to a hearing, but the agency in its discretion may nevertheless grant a hearing.
- 8. Respondent failed to file a Notice of Defense within 15 days after service upon her of the Accusation, and therefore waived her right to a hearing on the merits of Accusation No. 2013-143.
 - 9. California Government Code section 11520 states, in pertinent part:
 - (a) If the respondent either fails to file a notice of defense or to appear at the

hearing, the agency may take action based upon the respondent's express admissions or upon other evidence and affidavits may be used as evidence without any notice to respondent.

- 10. Pursuant to its authority under Government Code section 11520, the Board finds Respondent is in default. The Board will take action without further hearing and, based on the relevant evidence contained in the Default Decision Evidence Packet in this matter, as well as taking official notice of all the investigatory reports, exhibits and statements contained therein on file at the Board's offices regarding the allegations contained in Accusation No. 2013-143, finds that the charges and allegations in Accusation No. 2013-143, are separately and severally, found to be true and correct by clear and convincing evidence.
- 11. Taking official notice of its own internal records, pursuant to Business and Professions Code section 125.3, it is hereby determined that the reasonable costs for Investigation and Enforcement is \$1,037.50 as of September 25, 2012.

DETERMINATION OF ISSUES

- 1. Based on the foregoing findings of fact, Respondent Mary Lois Benjamin, aka Mary Lois Rahming has subjected her Registered Nurse License No. 479254 to discipline.
 - 2. The agency has jurisdiction to adjudicate this case by default.
- 3. The Board of Registered Nursing is authorized to revoke Respondent's Registered Nurse License based upon the following violations alleged in the Accusation which are supported by the evidence contained in the Default Decision Evidence Packet in this case.
- a. Respondent is subject to disciplinary action under section 2761, subdivision (a)(4) of the Code on the grounds of unprofessional conduct in that on or about March 16, 2005, the Arizona State Board of Nursing ("Arizona Board") disciplined Respondent's license in that state. Specifically, the Arizona Board made findings of fact, conclusions of law and issued Order No. 0209076 revoking Respondent's professional nurse license. The circumstances underlying the disciplinary action by the Arizona Board are described in more particularity in Accusation No. 2013-143 hereby incorporated by reference.

Respondent is subject to disciplinary action under section 2761, subdivision (a) of the b. 1 Code on the grounds of unprofessional conduct. The conduct is described in more particularity in 2 Accusation No. 2013-143 hereby incorporated by reference. 3 /// 4 /// 5 6 /// /// 7 8 117 9 /// 10 /// 11 111 12 /// 13 /// 14 /// 15 /// 16 /// 17 /// 18 /// 19 ///-/// 20 /// 21 141 22 23 /// /// 24 25 /// /// 26 27 /// 28 ///

DEFAULT DECISION AND ORDER

ORDER

IT IS SO ORDERED that Registered Nurse License No. 479254, heretofore issued to Respondent Mary Lois Benjamin, aka Mary Lois Rahming, is revoked.

Pursuant to Government Code section 11520, subdivision (c), Respondent may serve a written motion requesting that the Decision be vacated and stating the grounds relied on within seven (7) days after service of the Decision on Respondent. The agency in its discretion may vacate the Decision and grant a hearing on a showing of good cause, as defined in the statute.

This Decision shall become effective on _____

It is so ORDERED

FOR THE BOARD OF REGISTERED NURSING DEPARTMENT OF CONSUMER AFFAIRS

default decision_LIC.rtf DOJ Matter ID:LA2012507082

Attachment:
Exhibit A: Accusation

Exhibit A

Accusation

1		
2	Attorney General of California 2 GLORIA A. BARRIOS	
3	Supervising Deputy Attorney General	
	Deputy Attorney General	
4	300 So. Spring Street, Suite 1702	
5	Los Angeles, CA 90013 Telephone: (213) 897-2554	. •
6	Facsimile: (213) 897-2804	
. 7	Attorneys for Complainant	
8	11	
9		ER AFFAIRS
10	STATE OF CALIFOR	•
11	In the Matter of the Accusation Against: Case No.	2013-143
12		
13	LOIS RAHMING	SATION
	217 W. 66th Street	SATION
14	_ Los ringolos, erryocos	
15	1109.500.700 1 100.700 500.7000 500.700 500.700 500.700 500.700 500.700 500.700 500.700 500.700 500.700 500.700	
16	Respondent.	
17	7	
18	Complainant alleges:	
19	PARTIES PARTIES	
20	1. Louise R. Bailey, M.Ed., RN ("Complainant")	brings this Accusation solely in her
21	official capacity as the Executive Officer of the Board of R	egistered Nursing, Department of
22	2 Consumer Affairs.	
23	2. On or about June 30, 1992, the Board of Regist	ered Nursing issued Registered Nurse
24	License Number 479254 to Mary Lois Benjamin, aka Mary	Lois Rahming ("Respondent"). The
25	Registered Nurse License expired on January 31, 2008, and	l has not been renewed.
26	JURISDICTION AND STATUTOR	Y PROVISIONS
27	7 3. This Accusation is brought before the Board of	Registered Nursing ("Board"),
28	Department of Consumer Affairs, under the authority of the	e following laws. All section
,		

references are to the Business and Professions Code ("Code") unless otherwise indicated.

- Section 2750 of the Code provides, in pertinent part, that the Board may discipline any licensee, including a licensee holding a temporary or an inactive license, for any reason provided in Article 3 (commencing with section 2750) of the Nursing Practice Act.
- Section 118, subdivision (b), of the Code provides that the suspension, expiration, 5. surrender or cancellation of a license shall not deprive the Board of jurisdiction to proceed with a disciplinary action during the period within which the license may be renewed, restored, reissued or reinstated.
- 6. Section 2764 of the Code provides, in pertinent part, that the expiration of a license shall not deprive the Board of jurisdiction to proceed with a disciplinary proceeding against the licensee or to render a decision imposing discipline on the license. Section 2811(b) of the Code provides, in pertinent part, that the Board may renew an expired license at any time within eight years after the expiration.
 - 7. Section 2761 of the Code provides, in pertinent part:

"The board may take disciplinary action against a certified or licensed nurse or deny an application for a certificate or license for any of the following:

(a) Unprofessional conduct, which includes, but is not limited to, the following:

(4) Denial of licensure, revocation, suspension, restriction, or any other disciplinary action against a health care professional license or certificate by another state or territory of the United States, by any other government agency, or by another California health care professional licensing board. A certified copy of the decision or judgment shall be conclusive evidence of that action."

COST RECOVERY

Section 125.3 of the Code provides, in pertinent part, that the Board may request the 8. administrative law judge to direct a licentiate found to have committed a violation or violations of the licensing act to pay a sum not to exceed the reasonable costs of the investigation and enforcement of the case.

111 27 28

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

FIRST CAUSE FOR DISCIPLINE

(Disciplinary Action by the Arizona State Board of Nursing)

- 9. Respondent is subject to disciplinary action under section 2761, subdivision (a)(4) of the Code on the grounds of unprofessional conduct in that Respondent was disciplined by the Arizona State Board of Nursing ("Arizona Board"), as follows:
- 10. On or about March 16, 2005, the Arizona Board made findings of fact, conclusions of law and issued Order No. 0209076 revoking Respondent's professional nurse license in the disciplinary matter entitled *In the Matter of Professional Nurse License No. RN077767 Issued to:* Mary Lois Benjamin aka Mary Lois Rahming. The circumstances underlying the disciplinary action by the Arizona Board are as follows:
- a. On or about August 22, 2002, while employed by All Medical Staffing and assigned to work at Plaza Healthcare in Scottsdale, Arizona, Respondent conducted herself unprofessionally while assigned to care for resident R.M. when she allegedly delayed administration of pain medication for two to two and a half hours after requested by R.M., refused to provide eye care to R.M., made rude verbal comments to R.M. and flushed R.M.'s gatrostomy tube with ice water causing R.M. gastrointestinal discomfort.
- b. On or about October 1991, Respondent submitted her initial application for licensure by endorsement to the Arizona Board. Respondent failed to disclose her Texas R.N. license that was issued on or about October 14, 1981. Respondent also failed to disclose a disciplinary action by the United States Army for "other unprofessional conduct on or about November 7, 1988.
- c. On or about November 20, 2000, Respondent submitted a renewal application to the Arizona Board and failed to disclose her R.N. licenses in California, Pennsylvania, New York, South Carolina and Texas.
- d. On or about December 22, 1987, Respondent was found guilty of two counts of disobeying a lawful order from a superior officer, three counts of behaving with disrespect towards a superior officer, failing to be at her appointed place of duty on 18 different dates and for disorderly conduct in the company of enlisted soldiers. On or about December 22, 1987, her sentence included her dismissal from the service and confinement in a military jail for one year.

Respondent's confinement was later rescinded and reduced to time served, three days. On or about August 23, 1989, Respondent's sentence was upheld on appeal. On or about June 20, 1990, Respondent ceased to be an officer in the United States Army. The conduct underlying the Court Martial is that on or about April 12, 1988, in General Court Martial 37 in the Headquarters, 4th Infantry Division (Mechanized), Fort Carson, Colorado, Respondent who was a 2nd Lieutenant at the U.S. Army Medical Center Brigade at Fitzsimmons Army Medical Center in Aurora, CO, was charged with conduct unbecoming of an officer for offenses occurring on or between March 13, 1987, and October 21, 1987, including disobeying and disrespecting a superior officer, disorderly conduct in the presence of enlisted soldiers and failing to appear at her assigned duty station on 18 different occasions. The conduct described included telling a superior officer, with words to the effect, "I am not going to the mental status evaluation appointment, I have my own priorities and you should keep the mental status appointment for yourself," and for throwing the contents of her urine sample specimen container to the floor in an act of contempt, thereby splashing a noncommissioned officer.

- e. From on or about June 2000 to on or about March 5, 2001, and from on or about January 14, 2004 to on or about April 13, 2004, Respondent was employed as a registry nurse for Dependable Nurses, Inc. ("DNI") in Phoenix, Arizona. Respondent's employee records indicated that from on or about October 1997¹ to on or about February 2001, Respondent was counseled approximately 12 different occasions that she fell asleep while on duty either sitting or standing. When confronted about the incidents, Respondent became defensive, rude and/or angry. Respondent was made a "do not return" in at least 13 facilities for this behavior. Respondent's work performance was rated either "unsatisfactory" or "needs improvement" in several areas.
- f. On or about June 22, 2000, while employed by DNI, Respondent was assigned to a medical unit at St. Joseph's Hospital and Medical Center in Phoenix, Arizona. The unit's charge nurse, in a written complaint to DNI, expressed her concern that the company assigned a "new grad nurse" to their unit. The charge nurse indicated that Respondent was unable to draw up two

¹ This inconsistency is contained in the certified Arizona State Board of Nursing document. It would appear that 1997 is a typo as Respondent was not employed by DNI until approximately June 2000.

- (2) units of Insulin without assistance. In response, DNI confirmed Respondent's 17 year work history as a R.N.
- g. From on or about June 13, 2003, to on or about July 13, 2003, Respondent was employed by Bridge Staffing, Inc. and assigned to work at Medical Center at the University of South Carolina as a traveling nurse. Respondent's employment was terminated early from her block assignment due to her time and attendance issues.
- h. From on or about January 27, 2003, to on or about February 2, 2003, Respondent was employed by US Staffing Corporation, Inc. and assigned to work at a hospital in Pennsylvania. Respondents employment was involuntarily terminated for her "violation of company policies and unsatisfactory performance."
- i. On or about December 31, 2002, the Arizona Board received Respondent's written response to the complaint. Respondent failed to disclose her nursing licenses in Pennsylvania, New York, Texas, Georgia and South Carolina.
- j. On or about April 2, 2004, Respondent was interviewed by two Arizona Board consultants regarding the complaint. She provided evasive information about her Court Martial. Respondent would not confirm or deny her discharge status from military service.
- k. On or about May 21, 2004, the Arizona Board issued an Interim Order for Respondent to undergo a psychological evaluation with psychometric testing by an Arizona Board approved evaluator. On or about June 30, 2004, Respondent underwent the evaluation. The evaluator opined that Respondent has difficulty with authority, Respondent has moderate to severe inefficiency in the area of concept formation and problem solving, that the evaluator has concern related to multiple incidents of sleeping while on duty, that Respondent's behaviors documented over time may reflect a possibility of substance abuse or neurological insult. The evaluator recommended that Respondent also receive a neuropsychological evaluation in order to facilitate a differential impression and consequent interventions.
- l. On or about July 22, 2004, the Arizona Board issued a consent agreement for a 24 month practice probation, with attached stipulations and required Respondent to undergo a

neuropsychological evaluation and complete all treatment recommendations by the Arizona

- From on or about August 8, 2004, to on or about September 3, 2004, Respondent was employed by Dependable Nurses of Tucson ("DNT") as a registry nurse and assigned to work as a staff nurse at Devon Gables in Tucson, Arizona.
- On or about September 2, 2004, a complaint was filed by DNT and Dependable Home Health ("DHH") Service of Tucson. The complaint alleged that on or about August 30, 2004, Respondent visited the home of a DHH patient without authorization for 5 or 6 hours. Respondent allegedly performed a physical assessment of the patient's respiratory system without medical equipment, informed the patient that she was in congestive heart failure and instructed the patient to take an extra dose of diuretic medication (Lasix) and increased the patient's oxygen level from 2 liters per minute to 4.5 liters per minute without notifying or contacting the patient's physician, the assigned home health nurse and the home health agency.
- On or about September 3, 2004, Respondent was terminated by DNT and instructed

SECOND CAUSE FOR DISCIPLINE

(Unprofessional Conduct)

Code on the grounds of unprofessional conduct. The circumstances underlying the
inprofessional conduct are described in more particularity in paragraph 9, subdivisions (a)
hrough (o) above, inclusive, and herein incorporated by reference.

111 24

25 ///

26 ///

/// 27

1 /// 2 **PRAYER** 3 WHEREFORE, Complainant requests that a hearing be held on the matters herein alleged, 4 and that following the hearing, the Board of Registered Nursing issue a decision: 5 Revoking or suspending Registered Nurse License Number 479254, issued to Mary 6 Lois Benjamin, aka Mary Lois Rahming; 7. 2. Ordering Mary Lois Benjamin, aka Mary Lois Rahming to pay the Board of 8 Registered Nursing the reasonable costs of the investigation and enforcement of this case, 9 pursuant to Business and Professions Code section 125.3; 10 3. Taking such other and further action as deemed necessary and proper. 11 12 13 14 15 **Executive Officer** 16 Board of Registered Nursing Department of Consumer Affairs 17 State of California Complainant 18 19 LA2012507082 51129012.doc 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27 28